Dynamical bounds for quasiperiodic Schrödinger operators with rough potentials

Svetlana Jitomirskaya*and Rajinder Mavi†

arXiv:1412.0309v4 [math-ph] 4 Feb 2016

Abstract

We establish localization type dynamical bounds as a corollary of positive Lyapunov exponents for general operators with one-frequency quasiperiodic potentials defined by piecewise Hölder functions. This, in particular, extends some results previously known only for trigonometric polynomials [9] to the case of surprisingly low regularity. On the technical level, an important part of the argument is an extension of uniform uppersemicontinuity to cocycles with discontinuities, a result of independent interest.

1 Introduction

We will study the quantum dynamical properties of Schrödinger Hamiltonian acting on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$.

$$\mathfrak{h}_\theta u(n) = u(n-1) + u(n+1) + f(n\omega+\theta)u(n). \tag{1.1}$$

where $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\mathbb{Q}$ and $f : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$, in the regime of positive Lyapunov exponents. The evolution of a wave packet under the Hamiltonian (1.1) is given by the formula

$$u(t) = e^{-it\mathfrak{h}_\theta}u(0)$$

Dynamical localization, i.e. the nonspread as $t \to \infty$ of $u(t)$ with initially localized $u(0)$, is related to various quantities that can be measured in an experiment. It is often assumed by physicists to be a corollary of positivity of Lyapunov exponents, a quantity defined by dynamics of the associated cocycle and easily computable numerically. As mathematicians, we know however, that positive Lyapunov exponents, while implying no absolutely continuous spectrum, can coexist even with almost ballistic transport [26, 11] so one cannot expect dynamical localization in full generality, and for a more general result in the direction that physicists want, one has to tone down the notion of "nonspread" accordingly.

For a nonegative function $A(t)$ of time denote

$$\langle A(t)\rangle_T = \frac{2}{T}\int_0^\infty e^{-2t/T}A(t)dt$$

Let

$$a(n,t) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\left|\left\langle e^{-it\mathfrak{h}_\theta}\delta_0, \delta_n\right\rangle\right|^2 + \left|\left\langle e^{-it\mathfrak{h}_\theta}\delta_1, \delta_n\right\rangle\right|^2\right)$$

and

$$a_T(n) = \langle a(n,t)\rangle_T$$

Clearly, $\sum_n a_T(n) = \sum_n a(n,t) = 1$ for all t. The classical quantities of interest are the moments of the position operator, that can be defined both with time averaging

$$\langle |X|_T^p\rangle = \sum_n (1+|n|)^p a_T(n).$$

or without

$$\langle |X|^p(T)\rangle = \sum_n (1+|n|)^p a(n,T).$$

For $p > 0$ define the lower and upper transport exponents

$$\beta^+(p) = \limsup_{t\to\infty}\frac{\ln\langle |X|^p(t)\rangle}{p\ln t};\quad \beta^-(p) = \liminf_{t\to\infty}\frac{\ln\langle |X|_t^p\rangle}{p\ln t}.$$

*Department of Mathematics, University of California, Irvine CA, 92717, szhitomi@uci.edu
†Department of Mathematics, MSU, East Lansing, MI, 48824

determining the upper/lower power-law rate of growth of the moments along subsequences. Note that for the purposes of this paper we define the upper rate without time averaging, while the lower rate with time averaging.

Dynamical localization is defined as boundedness in T of $\langle |X|^p(T)\rangle$. This implies pure point spectrum, thus for parameters for which spectrum is singular continuous (known to be generic in many situations with positive Lyapunov exponents) one cannot have dynamical localization in this sense. Then, vanishing of β^+, or, in absence of that, at least of β^- are properties to look for. Moreover, dynamical localization is a property that is often unstable with respect to compact perturbations of the potential or phase shifts. In contrast, vanishing of β is always stable with respect to compact perturbations [9] and also with respect to phase shifts in all known examples. It should be noted however that such vanishing cannot be expected in general for operators (1.1) if the Lyapunov exponent is allowed to vanish even on a set of measure zero (as shown by Sturmian potentials), or, in a slightly more general context even if it vanishes at a single point [20].

The fact that $\beta(p)$ may depend nontrivially on p is the signature of intermittency, reflected on an even deeper level in the fact that different parts of the wave packet may spread at different rates. While any kind of upper bound discussed above requires control of the entire wave packet, even control of the spread of a portion of it is an interesting statement.

Set

$$P(N,t) = \sum_{|n|\le N} a(n,t),\ P_T(N) = \sum_{|n|\le N} a_T(n).$$

A bound of the form $P(T^a, T) > c$ shows that at time T a portion of the wave packet is confined in a box of size T^a. A bound $P_T(T^a) > c$ implies the corresponding statement for a weighted average over time. Thus a bound like that holding for arbitrary $a > 0$ can be considered as a signature of localization. It is natural in this respect to introduce two other scaling exponents:

$$\overline{\xi} = \lim_{\delta\to 0} \limsup_{T\to\infty} \frac{\ln(\inf\{L|P_T(L) > \delta\})}{\ln T}$$

and

$$\underline{\xi} = \lim_{\delta\to 0} \liminf_{T\to\infty} \frac{\ln(\inf\{L|P_T(L) > \delta\})}{\ln T}$$

Then vanishing of $\overline{\xi}$ or even $\underline{\xi}$ is again a localization-type statement.

Various quantities have been used to quantify quantum dynamics, see [2, 9] for a more comprehensive description. In this paper we focus on ξ and β only. Our main question is what kind of localization-type statements can be obtained from positivity of the Lyapunov exponents under very mild restrictions on regularity of the potential.

While the last decade has seen an explosion of general results for operators (1.1) with analytic f , see e.g. [4, 14] and references therein, and by now even the global theory of such operators is well developed [1], there are very few results beyond the analytic category that do not require energy exclusion [1] (with few recent exceptions [34, 33, 18] only confirming the rule). Indeed, not only the methods of proof usually require analyticity (or at least the Gevrey condition), but certain results fail to hold as long as analyticity is relaxed [32] (see also [17]). It is expected that many recent "analytic" results in fact do require analyticity. In this paper we show that, in contrast to the above, dynamical upper bounds can be obtained as a corollary of positive Lyapunov exponents under surprisingly weak regularity.

Namely, we allow f in (1.1) with only Hölder continuity, and even allow it to have finitely many *discontinuities* (so only require it to be locally Hölder). Allowing for discontinuities in the class of considered potentials is important for two reasons. First, the main explicit non-analytic operators (1.1) that appear in different contexts in physics literature [13, 30] have f with discontinuities. Several models that are well studied mathematically: Maryland, Fibonacci (or, more generally, Sturmian)[2] operators also belong to this class. Second, while there are few results on positivity of Lyapunov exponents for non-analytic f, the Lyapunov exponents of operators (1.1) with discontinuous f are *always* positive at least a.e. [8], providing us with a large collection of models for which our results are directly applicable. As far as we know, the present paper is the first one holding for a class of potentials that rough. Spectral localization for (continuous) Hölder potentials outside a set of energies of measure zero was established in [7], but there have been no dynamical bounds (see Footnote 1). In [18] we proved continuity of measure of the spectrum for (continuous) Hölder potentials.

We will say that f is piecewise Hölder if f has a finite set of discontinuities, J_f, and there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that $\|f\|_{PL_\gamma} < \infty$ where

$$\|f\|_{PL_\gamma} = \|f\|_\infty + \sup_{h>0} \sup_{t\in\mathbb{T}; dist(t,J_f)>|h|} \frac{|f(t+h) - f(t)|}{|h|^\gamma}.$$

[1] It should be noted that exclusion of any energies in localization type results, such as, e.g. [7], make upgrading to dynamical statements very problematic, as even a single energy that does not carry any spectral measure can lead to robust transport [20, 19]

[2] It should be mentioned that our analysis is not relevant to Fibonacci and most Sturmian models as for them the Lyapunov exponent vanishes on the spectrum

The functions f with finite $\|\cdot\|_{PL_\gamma}$ norm form the space of piecewise γ-Lipschitz functions, that we denote $PL_\gamma(\mathbb{T})$.

We will now introduce the Lyapunov exponent. For a given $z \in \mathbb{C}$, a formal solution u of

$$\mathfrak{h}_\theta u = zu \tag{1.2}$$

with operator $\mathfrak{h}_\theta$ given by (1.1) can be reconstructed from its values at two consecutive points with the transfer matrix

$$A^{f,z}(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} z - f(\theta) & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \qquad A^{f,z} : \mathbb{T} \to SL_2(\mathbb{C}) \tag{1.3}$$

via the equation

$$\begin{pmatrix} u(n+1) \\ u(n) \end{pmatrix} = A^{f,z}(\theta + n\omega) \begin{pmatrix} u(n) \\ u(n-1) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1.4}$$

Let us define the map $R : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{T}$ by $Rx := x + \omega$, then the pair $(\omega, A^{f,z})$ viewed as a linear skew-product $(x, v) \to (Rx, A^{f,z}(x)v),\ x \in \mathbb{T},\ v \in \mathbb{R}^2$, is called the corresponding Schrödinger cocycle. The iterations of the cocycle $(\omega, A^{f,z})$ for $k \geq 0$ are given by

$$A^{f,z}_k(\theta) = A^{f,z}(R^{(k-1)}\theta) \cdots A^{f,z}(R^1\theta)A^{f,z}(\theta), \qquad A^{f,z}_0 = I \tag{1.5}$$

and

$$A^{f,z}_k(\theta) = \left(A^{f,z}_{-k}(R^{k+1}\theta)\right)^{-1}; \quad k < 0. \tag{1.6}$$

Therefore, it can be seen from (1.4) that a solution to (1.2) for chosen initial conditions $(u(0), u(-1))$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ is given by,

$$\begin{pmatrix} u(k) \\ u(k-1) \end{pmatrix} = A^{f,z}_k(\theta) \begin{pmatrix} u(0) \\ u(-1) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1.7}$$

By the general properties of subadditive ergodic cocycles, we can define the Lyapunov exponent

$$\mathcal{L}(z) = \lim_k \frac{1}{k} \int \ln \|A^{f,z}_k(\theta)\| \mathrm{d}\theta = \inf_k \frac{1}{k} \int \ln \|A^{f,z}_k(\theta)\| \mathrm{d}\theta, \tag{1.8}$$

furthermore, $\mathcal{L}(z) = \lim_k \frac{1}{k} \ln \|A^{f,z}_k(\theta)\|$ for almost all $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$.

Finally, we introduce the Diophantine condition. Writing ω in the continued fraction form

$$\omega = \cfrac{1}{a_1 + \cfrac{1}{a_2 + \ddots}} \equiv [a_1, a_2, \ldots],$$

the truncated continued fractions define the approximants $\frac{p_n}{q_n} = [a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n]$. We say that ω is Diophantine if for some $\kappa > 0$

$$q_{n+1} < q_n^{1+\kappa} \tag{1.9}$$

for all large n.

Our first result is that just positivity of the Lyapunov exponent on a positive measure subset of the spectrum already implies localization bounds for the transport of the bulk of a wave packet.

Let μ_θ be the spectral measure of $\mathfrak{h}_\theta$ and vector δ_0, by which we mean $\langle(\mathfrak{h}_\theta - z)^{-1}\delta_0, \delta_0\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d\mu_\theta(x)}{x-z}$ for z in the upper half plane and let $N := \int \mu_\theta d\theta$ be the integrated density of states measure.

Theorem 1.1 *For piecewise Hölder f and $\omega \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\mathbb{Q}$, suppose $\mathcal{L}(E)$ of (1.1) is positive on a Borel subset U with $N(U) > 0$. Then*

1. *For any irrational ω, $\underline{\xi} = 0$ for a.e. θ*
2. *If ω is Diophantine, then $\overline{\xi} = 0$ for a.e. θ*
3. *For all θ for $\zeta > 0$, $P_{T_k}(T_k^\zeta) > C\mu_\theta(U)$ for a sequence $T_k \to \infty$; moreover if ω is Diophantine, $P_T(T^\zeta) > C\mu_\theta(U)$ for all large T.*

Remark 1.2 *Positivity of the Lyapunov exponent on a positive IDS measure subset is clearly essential, as the result does not hold for Fibonacci-type models where Lyapunov exponent is positive a.e. but zero on the spectrum.*

The Diophantine condition is essential for vanishing of $\overline{\xi}$ as the result does not hold for Liouville ω ([21])

Remark 1.3 *The full measure sets of θ in cases 1 and 2 of Theorem 1.1 are specified by the set $\{\theta : \mu_\theta(U)+\mu_{R\theta}(U) > 0\}$. It is not entirely clear whether there are quasiperiodic examples with $N(E : \mathcal{L}(E) > 0) > 0$ and $\mu_\theta(E : \mathcal{L}(E) > 0) = 0$ for some θ.*

Remark 1.4 *It is an interesting question whether or not a.e. vanishing of $\underline{\xi}$ is a general corollary of positive Lyapunov exponents, so holds for all ergodic potentials. This may be reminiscent of the property of zero Hausdorff dimension of spectral measures of operators with positive Lyapunov exponents, which was originally proved for quasiperiodic operators with trigonometric polynomial potentials [16], but then turned out to be a general fact, easily extractable from some deep results of potential theory [28].*

Corollary 1.5 *Assume f is locally Hölder, has at least one point of discontinuity and that N has an absolutely continuous component. Then the conclusions of Theorem 1.1 hold.*

Proof Follows immediately from a.e. positivity of Lyapunov exponents of potentials with discontinuities (was proved in [8] with a conjecture made in [27]).

Remark 1.6 *A large class of examples of operators(1.1) with discontinuous f and absolutely continuous N is presented in [15]*

Other potentials have been shown to satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1.1 in various regimes in [3, 6, 25, 35]. In all those cases Theorem 1.1 improves on some of the known results since, even if the results potentially allowed for dynamical extensions, unlike Theorem 1.1 spectral localization cannot hold for all θ at least for continuous f that are even on the hull [19].

Certainly, not every f in (1.1) corresponds to a model relevant to physics, and since our main question is physically motivated, it is natural to impose assumptions that are necessary for physics relevance. In particular, Lyapunov exponent should be continuous in various parameters for operators coming from physics (although such continuity does not hold universally for operators (1.1) even for f in C^∞ [32]). Our next result has this as an assumption.

Theorem 1.7 *For piecewise Hölder f and $\omega \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\mathbb{Q}$ suppose $\mathcal{L}$ is continuous in E and $\mathcal{L}(E) > 0$ for every $E \in \mathbb{R}$. Then*

1. *$\beta^-_{(\omega,\theta)}(p) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$, $p > 0$;*
2. *if ω is Diophantine, then $\beta^+_{(\omega,\theta)}(p) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$, $p > 0$.*

Remark 1.8 *It is an interesting question whether or not vanishing of β^- is a general corollary of uniformly positive Lyapunov exponents in the regime of their continuity, so for all ergodic potentials. The analogy of Remark 1.4 may also apply.*

Remark 1.9 *The Diophantine condition is essential for vanishing of β^+ [21].*

It is sometimes useful to consider (1.1) with a scalable potential f. Let us introduce,

$$\mathfrak{h}_{\theta,\lambda}u(n) = u(n-1) + u(n+1) + \lambda f(n\omega+\theta)u(n). \tag{1.10}$$

for a parameter $\lambda > 0$.

Corollary 1.10 *If f is C^2 with exactly two nondegenerate extrema, and ω is Diophantine, then there is some $\lambda(f,\omega) > 0$ so that, for $\lambda > \lambda(f,\omega)$, $\beta^+_{(\omega,\theta)}(p) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$, $p > 0$.*

Note that this is the first dynamical bound for C^2 potentials.

Proof. Follows directly from Theorem 1.7 and the results of [34].

Corollary 1.11 *If f is analytic, then, there is $\lambda(f) > 0$ so that for $\lambda > \lambda(f)$ both conclusions of Theorem 1.7 hold.*

Proof follows from non-perturbative positivity [29] and continuity [5] of the Lyapunov exponent for analytic f.

Remark 1.12 *The conclusions of Theorem (1.7) were established in a combination of [9] and [10] for trigonometric polynomial f. The result of [9] allows for a weaker Diophantine condition than ours. Namely it holds for ω such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\ln q_{n+1}}{q_n} = 0. \tag{1.11}$$

Our current proof does not automatically extend to this condition because of the need to tackle low regularity. A simple modification of the proof allows to obtain this result for ω satisfying (1.11) and analytic f but not $f \in C^\gamma$.

Recall that a function $f : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{R}$ is Gevrey if it is C^∞ and there is some $s \leq 1$ so that there exist $M, K < \infty$ so that for all $m \geq 1$

$$\sup_x |\partial^m f(x)| < MK^m (m!)^s.$$

We say a Gevrey function f satisfies the tranversality condition if for all $x \in \mathbb{T}$ there exists an $m \geq 1$ so that $\partial^m f(x) \neq 0$.

Corollary 1.13 *If f is Gevrey with a transversality condition and ω is Diophantine, then there is some $\lambda(f, \omega) > 0$ so that for $\lambda > \lambda(f, \omega)$, $\beta^+_{(\omega,\theta)}(p) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$, $p > 0$.*

Proof Follows from Theorem 1.7 and the results of [25]

Remark 1.14 *$\lambda(f, \omega)$ depends on ω through its Diophantine class. In [25] Anderson localization is established for all θ and a.e. ω in this class (depending on θ.)*

Another immediate corollary can be obtained for a class of discontinuous f monotone on the period as considered in [15]. Then, Anderson localization is established in [15] for Diophantine ω, while continuity (and positivity for large λ) of the Lyapunov exponent is established for all ω. Theorem 1.7 immediately implies in this case vanishing of β^- for λ as above and all θ and all ω.

For the proof of Theorem 1.1 we use a criterion from [24], and to prove Theorem 1.7 apply the results of [10]. This is done in Section 2. To apply those results we need to establish certain lower bounds on transfer matrices. To obtain this we build on the technique we introduced in [18]. On the technical side, our main achievement is in both extending the method of [18] to allow discontinuities and in establishing the underlying uniform upper bound for uniquely ergodic dynamics to the case of cocycles with zero measure set of discontinuities. The latter is a general result that is of independent interest and of the type that has been crucial in various proofs of localization/regularity in many recent articles. Our extension has already been used in [15] for their spectral localization theorem and in [21] for their dimensional analysis of Sturmian potentials.

2 Key lemmas

Both [24] and [10] (see lemma's 2.3 and 2.4) reduce the dynamical bounds to lower estimates on the norms of the transfer matrices over controlled scales. Essentially, one needs to establish polynomial growth of any order at scales uniform in energy. Positivity of the Lyapunov exponents per se implies such lower bounds, so it remains to establish uniform control over the scales. This is done in Proposition 2.1.

For any $\delta \geq 1$ and $1 \geq \zeta > 0$ we define, for $E \in \mathbb{C}$ and $T > 0$

$$\Phi_{\zeta,\delta}(E, T) = \inf \left(\min \left\{ \frac{\max_{1 \leq j \leq T^\zeta} \|A_j(\theta, z)\|^2}{T^\delta}, \frac{\max_{1 \leq j \leq T^\zeta} \|A_{-j}(\theta, z)\|^2}{T^\delta} \right\} \right)$$

where the infimum is over all $|z - E| \leq T^{-\zeta}$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$. We will establish

Proposition 2.1 *Suppose $f \in PL_\gamma(\mathbb{T}), \chi > 0$, and suppose $\mathcal{L}(E) > \chi$ for all E in a Borel set $U \subset \mathbb{R}$. Then, for any $\delta \geq 1$ and $1 \geq \zeta > 0$ we have, there is some $c > 0$ and sequence (T_n) so that for every $E \in U$, there is some n_E so that, for $n > n_E$*

$$\Phi_{\zeta,\delta}(E, T_n) > c. \tag{2.1}$$

If ω is Diophantine, for each $E \in U$ there is $T_E < \infty$ so that for $T > T_E$,

$$\Phi_{\zeta,\delta}(E, T) > c. \tag{2.2}$$

Finally, if U is compact and $\mathcal{L}$ is continuous then for all rotations ω there is some $n_0 < \infty$ so that for all $E \in U$ we can set $n_E = n_0$ in (2.1), and if ω is Diophantine there is some $T_0 < \infty$ so that for all $E \in U$ we can set $T_E = T_0$ in (2.2).

This propostion is essentially a corollary of the following Lemma.

Lemma 2.2 *Suppose $f \in PL_\gamma$, $\mathcal{L}(E) > 0$. For any $\tau > 0$ there exists $k_\tau = k_\tau(E) < \infty$ so that if $q_n > e^{\frac{k_\tau \mathcal{L}(E)\tau}{\gamma}}$, then for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $k_\tau < k < \frac{\gamma}{\mathcal{L}(E)\tau} \ln q_n$ then for any $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$ there is some $0 < x \leq q_n + q_{n-1} - 1$ so that for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|z - E| < \exp\{-\tau k \mathcal{L}(E)\}$*

$$\left\| A_k^{f,z}(R^x \theta) \right\| \geq e^{k(1-\tau)\mathcal{L}(E)}.$$

If $\mathcal{L}$ is continuous and U is compact, then k_τ can be chosen uniformly over $E \in U$.

We will in fact prove a more general statement, for cocycles defined in a neighborhood of f, see Lemma 4.3. The proofs of Proposition 2.1 and Lemma 2.2 are in section 4. They are based on section 3 where we prove convergence results for discontinuous cocycles in a general setting. The remainder of this section is dedicated to proving Theorems 1.1 and 1.7.

For $f : \mathbb{Z} \to H$, where H is some Banach space and $L \geq 1$, the truncated ℓ^2 norm in the positive direction is defined as

$$\|f\|_L^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\lfloor L \rfloor} |f(n)|^2 + (L - \lfloor L \rfloor)\,|f(\lfloor L \rfloor + 1)|^2.$$

The truncated ℓ^2 norm in both directions, for $L_1, L_2 \geq 1$, will be denoted

$$\|f\|_{L_1,L_2}^2 = \sum_{n=-\lfloor L_1 \rfloor}^{\lfloor L_2 \rfloor} |f(n)|^2 + (L_1 - \lfloor L_1 \rfloor)\,|f(-\lfloor L_1 \rfloor - 1)|^2 + (L_2 - \lfloor L_2 \rfloor)\,|f(\lfloor L_2 \rfloor + 1)|^2.$$

With $A_\bullet(\theta, E)$ a function on $\mathbb{Z}$, define $\tilde{L}_\epsilon^+(\theta, E) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ by requiring that the truncated ℓ^2 norm obeys

$$\|A_\bullet(\theta, E)\|_{\tilde{L}_\epsilon^+(\theta,E)} = 2\|A_1(\theta, E)^{-1}\|\epsilon^{-1}.$$

We now recall the following result of Killip, Kiselev and Last,

Lemma 2.3 *(Theorem 1.5 of [24]) Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be a Schrödinger operator and μ the spectral measure of $\mathfrak{h}$ and δ_1. Let $T > 0$ and $L_1, L_2 > 2$, then*

$$\langle \|e^{-it\mathfrak{h}}\delta_1\|_{L_1,L_2}^2 \rangle_T > C\mu\left(\left\{E : \tilde{L}_{T^{-1}}^- \leq L_1; \tilde{L}_{T^{-1}}^+ \leq L_2\right\}\right) \tag{2.3}$$

where C is a universal constant.

Proof of Theorem 1.1.

We first prove part 3. Assume $\mu_\theta(U) > 0$. For $\epsilon > 0$, let $\chi > 0$ be such that

$$\mu_\theta(\{E \in U : \mathcal{L}(E) > \chi\}) > \mu_\theta(U) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Let $\zeta > 0$. First consider the Diophantine case. Then by Proposition 2.1 with $\delta = 3$, for $E \in U$ we have $\Phi_{\zeta,3}(E, t) > c_E > 0$ for $t > T_E$. Therefore we can find $M_\epsilon > 0$, so that outside a set of E of measure $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$,

$$\|A_\bullet(\theta, E)\|_{T^\zeta} > T \tag{2.4}$$

for $T > M_\epsilon$. Thus $\tilde{L}_{T^{-1}}^\pm(\theta, E) < T^\zeta$ for all $T > M_\epsilon$. We have from Lemma 2.3

$$\langle \|e^{-it\mathfrak{h}_\theta}\delta_0\|_{T^\zeta}^2 \rangle_T > C(\mu_\theta(U) - \epsilon). \tag{2.5}$$

If ω is not Diophantine, (2.4) is satisfied for a sequence $T_k \to \infty$, thus (2.5) holds for a sequence T_k. As (2.5) holds for all ϵ we can let $\epsilon \to 0$. ∎

To prove parts 1,2 note that if $\mu_\theta(U) + \mu_{R\theta}(U) > 0$ we have by (2.5) that either $\langle \|e^{-it\mathfrak{h}_\theta}\delta_0\|_{T_k^\zeta}^2 \rangle_{T_k} > c$ or $\langle \|e^{-it\mathfrak{h}_\theta}\delta_1\|_{T_k^\zeta}^2 \rangle_{T_k} > c$, so $P_{T_k}(T_k^\zeta) > c$, thus $\frac{\ln(\inf\{L | P_{T_k}(L) > \delta\})}{\ln T_k} < \zeta$. Since $\zeta > 0$ is arbitrary, for such θ we have that $\underline{\xi}$ (or $\overline{\xi}$ for Diophantine θ) are equal to zero. Finally observe that since the set $\{\theta : \mu_\theta(U) + \mu_{R\theta}(U) > 0\}$ is shift invariant, $N(U) > 0$ implies $\mu_\theta(U) + \mu_{R\theta}(U) > 0$ for a.e. θ. ∎

The following result of Damanik and Tcheremchantsev allows us to control the evolution of the entire wavepacket.

Lemma 2.4 *(Corollary 1 of [10] plus Theorem 1 of [9]) Let $\mathfrak{h}_\theta$ be operator (1.1), with f real valued and bounded, and $K \geq 4$ is such that $\sigma(\mathfrak{h}_\theta) \subset [-K + 1, K - 1]$. Suppose for all $\zeta \in (0, 1)$, we have*

$$\int_{-K}^{K} \left(\min_{s\in\{-1,1\}} \max_{1\leq n\leq T^\zeta} \left\| A_{sn}\left(E + \frac{i}{T}\right)\right\|^2 \right)^{-1} \mathrm{d}E = O(T^{-\delta}) \tag{2.6}$$

for every $\delta \geq 1$. Then $\beta^+(p) = 0$ for all $p > 0$. If (2.6) is satisfied for a sequence $T_k \to \infty$, then $\beta^-(p) = 0$ for all $p > 0$.

Proof of Theorem 1.7 Assume $\sigma(\mathfrak{h}) \subset [-K + 1, K - 1]$. Let $R > K$ and let $\chi = \inf_{|z|<R}\{\mathcal{L}(z)\}$. We assume continuity so $\chi > 0$ and there exists a large $M < \infty$ so that (2.2) holds uniformly for all $T > M$ and $E \in \{E \in \mathbb{C} : |\mathcal{R}(E)| \leq K; |\mathcal{I}(E)| \leq 1\}$. Thus for large enough T and ω Diophantine we have

$$\int_{-K}^{K} \left(\max_{1\leq \pm n\leq T^\zeta} \left\| A_n\left(E + \frac{i}{T}\right)\right\|^2 \right)^{-1} \mathrm{d}E \leq CKT^{-\delta} = O(T^{-\delta}). \tag{2.7}$$

If ω is not Diophantine, we use (2.1) to find (2.7) is satisfied for a sequence of $T_k \to \infty$. ∎

3 Rough cocycles

The goal of this section is to establish the uniformity of uppersemicontinuity of the Lyapunov exponent. It is known (see e.g. [18]) the pointwise Lyapunov exponent has uniform upper bounds in small neighborhoods for continuous cocycles. Here we show the requirement of continuity of cocycles can be relaxed. Let (X, R, μ) be a uniquely ergodic compact Borel probability space. We will say a function f is *almost continuous* if its set of discontinuities has a closure of measure zero. Let $\mathbb{B}_\infty(X)$ be the space of bounded functions on X with

$$\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{x\in X} |f(x)|,$$

Notice that sets of measure zero are not dismissed by this norm. For a Borel set $D \subset X$ define a seminorm

$$\|f\|_{D,\infty} = \sup_{x\in D} |f(x)|.$$

A subadditive cocycle on (X, T, μ) is a sequence of functions $f_1, f_2, \dots$ on X so that $f_{n+m}(x) \le f_n(x) + f_m(R^n x)$. We use the notation $\{f\}$ for a subadditive cocycle $f_1, f_2, \dots$. Let $\Delta(X)$ be the set of all $\{f\}$ with $f_n \in \mathbb{B}_\infty$ for all n . By Kingman's subadditive ergodic theorem [31], a subadditive cocycle $f_n(\cdot)$ on (X, T, μ) obeys, for μ-almost all $x \in X$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} f_n(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_X f_n(x)\mu(\mathrm{d}x) = \Lambda(f)$$

Let $E_n = E_n(\{f\})$ be the closure of the set of discontinuities of f_n. For a set $E \subset X$ define a ball, $B_\delta(E) = \{x \in X : \exists e \in E, |x - e| < \delta\}$. Then we introduce, for $\delta \ge 0$ the sequence of sets $D_n = X\backslash\overline{B_\delta(E_n(\{f\}))}$, and a pseudometric

$$\mathrm{d}_\delta(\{g\}, \{f\}) = \sum_{n\ge 1} \frac{1}{2^n} \frac{\|g_n - f_n\|_{D_n,\infty}}{1 + \|g_n - f_n\|_{D_n,\infty}}.$$

From this pseudometric we define the δ-σ neighborhood of $\{f\}$ as,

$$\mathcal{N}_{\delta;\sigma}(\{f\}) = \{\{g\} : \mathrm{d}_\delta(\{f\}, \{g\}) < \sigma\}.$$

Theorem 3.1 *Suppose $\{f\} \in \Delta(X)$ so that f_n is almost continuous for all n. Let $\epsilon > 0$. There exists $\delta > 0$ and $\sigma > 0$ and $K < \infty$ all depending on $\{f\}$ and ϵ so that for $\{g\} \in \mathcal{N}_{\delta;\sigma}(\{f\}) \cap \mathbb{B}_\infty$ and $n > K$ implies*

$$\frac{1}{n} g_n < \Lambda(f) + \epsilon \max\{\|g\|_\infty, 1\}$$

The result extends the theorem of Furman [12] and our recent extension of it [18] to the case of almost continuous subadditive cocycles. Here is a simple appplication of the theorem to a single subadditive cocycle.

Corollary 3.2 *Suppose f_n are almost continuous and subadditive and $\|f_1\|_\infty < \infty$. For any $\epsilon > 0$ there is $K < \infty$ so that for $n > K$ and all $x \in X$ we have*

$$\frac{1}{n} f_n(x) < \Lambda(f) + \epsilon$$

A further corollary arises in the application to matrix cocycles for an almost continuous matrix $M : X \to SL_2(\mathbb{C})$. Let R be a uniquely ergodic transformation on X, and define the associated cocycle,

$$M_k(\theta) = M(R^{(k-1)}\theta) \cdots M(R\theta).$$

Let E be the set of discontinuities of M, let $B = B_\delta(E)$ be the set of points with in distance δ of E. Let $E_n = E_n(\{\ln \|M_n\|\})$ and notice that $B_\delta(E_n) \subset \cup_{\ell=0}^{n-1} R^{-\ell} B$. Let $D_n = X\backslash\overline{B_\delta(E_n)}$. Finally, let $\mathcal{L}(M)$ be the Lyapunov exponent $\Lambda(\{\ln \|M_n\|\})$.

Corollary 3.3 *Suppose $M : X \to SL_2(\mathbb{C})$ is almost continuous and bounded. For any $\epsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$, $\rho > 0$, and $K < \infty$ such that if $\overline{M} : X \to SL_2(\mathbb{C})$ is bounded [3] so that $\|\overline{M} - M\|_{X\backslash B_\delta(E),\infty} < \rho$, then $k > K$ implies*

$$\|M_k(\theta) - \overline{M}_k(\theta)\| < \max_{0\le i\le k-1} \{\|M(R^i\theta) - \overline{M}(R^i\theta)\|\} e^{k(\mathcal{L}(M)+\epsilon \max\{1, \ln \|\overline{M}\|_\infty\})}$$

For our application we only need the $\delta = 0$ version:

[3] Note there is no assumption of continuity

Corollary 3.4 *Suppose $M : X \to SL_2(\mathbb{C})$ is almost continuous and bounded. For any $\epsilon > 0$, there is $\rho > 0$ and $K < \infty$ such that if $\overline{M} : X \to SL_2(\mathbb{C})$ is bounded and $\|\overline{M} - M\|_\infty < \rho$, then $k > K$ implies*

$$\|M_k(\theta) - \overline{M}_k(\theta)\| < \max_{0\le i\le k-1}\{\|M(R^i\theta) - \overline{M}(R^i\theta)\|\}e^{k(\mathcal{L}(M)+\epsilon\max\{1,\ln\|\overline{M}\|_\infty\})}$$

Proof of Theorem 3.1 Let $\epsilon < (1 + 2\|f_1\|_\infty)^{-1}$. $X\backslash E_n$ is an open set of full measure, and for every $x \in X\backslash E_n$, f_n is continuous in a neighborhood of x. The set

$$J_n = \left\{x \in X\backslash E_n : |\tfrac{1}{n}f_n(x) - \Lambda(f)| < \epsilon\right\}$$

is open and by Kingman's theorem $\mu(J_n^c) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

Let $n > 1$ be large enough so that $\mu(J_n^c) < \epsilon$. Let $\delta > 0$ be such that $\mu(\overline{B_\delta(E_n)}) < \epsilon$. Define $D_n = X\backslash\overline{B_\delta(E_n)}$. For any $\{g\} \in \mathcal{N}_{\delta,\epsilon/2^n}(\{f\})$, and for $x \in J_n \cap D_n$ we have $f_n(x) < n(\Lambda(f) + \epsilon)$ which implies

$$g_n(x) \le |f_n(x)| + |g_n(x) - f_n(x)| < n(\Lambda(f) + \epsilon) + 2\epsilon \le n(\Lambda(f) + 2\epsilon). \tag{3.1}$$

Note that $J_n^c \cup D_n^c$ is a closed set of μ measure less than 2ϵ. We will now follow the idea in the Weiss-Katznelson proof of Kingman's theorem [23], adapting it to the setting with discontinuities. By regularity of the Borel measure, there is an open set D containing $J_n^c \cup D_n^c$ of measure less than 3ϵ, and by Urysohn's lemma there is a continuous function $0 \le h \le 1$ so that $h|_{J_n^c\cup D_n^c} = 1$ and $h|_{D^c} = 0$. Since (X, T, μ) is compact uniquely ergodic there exists some $M_1 < \infty$ so that for $M > M_1$ and all x, $|\frac{1}{M}\sum_{i=1}^M h(T^ix) - \int h d\mu| < \epsilon$. For any $x \in X$ construct a sequence (x_i) in X in the following way. For $i = 1$ let $x_1 = x$ and for subsequent terms let $x_{i+1} = T^{n_i}x_i$; where n_i is defined as

$$n_i = n_i(x) = \begin{cases} n, & \text{if } x_i \in J_n \cap D_n \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

We now consider the cocycles for a sufficiently large index. Let $M > \max\{\frac{n}{\epsilon}, M_1\}$, and choose p so that

$$n_1 + \cdots + n_{p-1} \le M < n_1 + \cdots + n_p.$$

Let $K = M - (n_1 + \cdots + n_{p-1}) \le n$. By subadditivity,

$$g_M(x) \le \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} g_{n_i}(x_i) + g_K(x_p) \le \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} g_{n_i}(x_i) + n\|g_1\|_\infty.$$

Partition the above sum into $x_i \in D_n \cap J_n$ and $x_i \in D_n^c \cup J_n^c$. On the former set use (3.1) and on the latter use the trivial bound $\|g_1\|_\infty$.

$$g_M(x) \le \sum_{i=1}^{p-1}\left[n_i\left(\Lambda(f) + 2\epsilon\right)\mathbf{1}_{J_n\cap D_n}(x_i) + \|g_1\|_\infty \cdot \mathbf{1}_{J_n^c\cup D_n^c}(x_i)\right] + n\|g_1\|_\infty. \tag{3.2}$$

Therefore, we have uniformly in x,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p-1}\|g_1\|_\infty \cdot \mathbf{1}_{J_n^c\cup D_n^c}(x_i) \le \sum_{i=1}^{M}\|g_1\|_\infty \cdot \mathbf{1}_{J_n^c\cup D_n^c}(T^ix) \le \sum_{i=1}^{M}\|g_1\|_\infty h\left(T^i(x)\right) < 4\epsilon\|g_1\|_\infty M$$

Substituting this into the sum on the right hand side of (3.2), we find

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{M}g_M(x) &\le \frac{1}{M}\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} n_i\left(\Lambda(f) + 2\epsilon\right)\mathbf{1}_{J_n\cap D_n}(x_i) + \frac{1}{M}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\|g_1\|_\infty \cdot \mathbf{1}_{J_n^c\cup D_n^c}(T^ix) + \frac{n}{M}\|g_1\|_\infty \\ &\le (\Lambda(f) + 2\epsilon) + 4\epsilon\|g_1\|_\infty + \frac{n}{M}\|g_1\|_\infty \\ &\le \Lambda(f) + 2\epsilon + 5\epsilon\|g_1\|_\infty.\end{aligned}$$

∎

We now prove Corollary 3.3 for almost continuous matrices.

Proof . Set $f_n(x) = \ln\|M_n(x)\|$, $g_n = \ln\|\overline{M}_n\|$. Then, since $M, \overline{M}$ are in $SL_2(\mathbb{C})$, we have

$$\left|\ln\|M_n(x)\| - \ln\|\overline{M}_n(x)\|\right| \le \left|\|M_n(x)\| - \|\overline{M}_n(x)\|\right| \le \|M_n(x) - \overline{M}_n(x)\|$$

Thus for $\delta, \sigma > 0$ there exists $\rho > 0$ so that $\|M - \overline{M}\|_\infty < \rho$ implies $d_\delta(\{f\}, \{g\}) < \sigma$. Therefore for $\|M - \overline{M}\|_\infty < \rho$ we have $\{g\} \in \mathcal{N}_{\delta;\sigma}(\{f\}) \cap \mathbb{B}_\infty$ so we are in a position to apply Theorem 3.1 which then yields that for $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $n_\epsilon < \infty$ so that for $n > n_\epsilon$, for any $x \in X$,

$$\|\overline{M}_n(x)\| < \exp\{n(\mathcal{L} + \epsilon Q)\} \tag{3.3}$$

where $Q = \max\{1, \ln \|\overline{M}\|_\infty\}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \Lambda(\{f\})$.

We have

$$\|M_k(\theta) - \overline{M}_k(\theta)\| \le \sum_{0 \le \ell \le k-1} \|\overline{M}_\ell(R^{k-\ell}\theta)(\overline{M} - M)(R^{k-1-\ell}\theta) M_{k-1-\ell}(\theta)\|$$

Thus

$$\|M_k(\theta) - \overline{M}_k(\theta)\| \le \sup_{0 \le \ell \le k-1} \left\{\|(\overline{M} - M)(R^{k-1-\ell}\theta)\|\right\} \sum_{0 \le \ell \le k-1} \|\overline{M}_\ell(R^{k-\ell}\theta)\| \|M_{k-1-\ell}(\theta)\|. \tag{3.4}$$

Let $k > 2n_\epsilon$. Then we can separate the above sum into $[0, n_\epsilon - 1]$, $[n_\epsilon, k - 1 - n_\epsilon]$, $[k - n_\epsilon, k - 1]$, On the second two intervals $\ell \ge n_\epsilon$, and on the first two intervals $k - 1 - \ell \ge n_\epsilon$ so we can apply (3.3) to $\overline{M}_\ell$ and $M_{k-1-\ell}$ respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k - n_\epsilon \le \ell \le k-1} \|\overline{M}_\ell(R^{k-\ell}\theta)\| \|M_{k-1-\ell}(\theta)\| &\le \sum_{k - n_\epsilon \le \ell \le k-1} \|M\|_\infty^{k-1-\ell} \exp\{(k - 1 - \ell)(\mathcal{L} + \epsilon Q)\} \\ &\le n_\epsilon \|M\|_\infty^{n_\epsilon} \exp\{(k-1)(\mathcal{L} + \epsilon Q)\} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for $\ell \in [0, n_\epsilon - 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{0 \le \ell \le n_\epsilon - 1} \|\overline{M}_\ell(R^{k-\ell}\theta)\| \|M_{k-1-\ell}(\theta)\| &\le \sum_{0 \le \ell \le n_\epsilon - 1} \|\overline{M}\|_\infty^{\ell} \exp\{(k - 1 - \ell)(\mathcal{L} + \epsilon Q)\} \\ &\le n_\epsilon e^{n_\epsilon Q} \exp\{(k-1)(\mathcal{L} + \epsilon Q\} \end{aligned}$$

On the center segment $\ell \in [n_\epsilon, k - 1 - n_\epsilon]$ both cocycles approach the upper Lyapunov limit, so we have using (3.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n_\epsilon \le \ell \le k-1-n_\epsilon} \|\overline{M}_\ell(R^{k-\ell}\theta)\| \|M_{k-1-\ell}(\theta)\| &\le \sum_{n_\epsilon \le \ell \le k-1-n_\epsilon} \exp\{(k-1)(\mathcal{L} + \epsilon Q)\} \\ &\le (k - 2n_\epsilon) \exp\{(k-1)(\mathcal{L} + \epsilon Q)\} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, there is some $K < \infty$ so that for $k > K$,

$$\sum_{0 \le \ell \le k-1} \|\overline{M}_\ell(R^{k-\ell}\theta)\| \|M_{k-1-\ell}(\theta)\| < \exp\{k(\mathcal{L} + 2\epsilon Q)\}$$

which together with (3.4) implies the result. ∎

Finally, an immediate corollary is

Lemma 3.5 *For $\mathcal{L}$ continuous on a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{C}$ given $\epsilon > 0$ there is a $k_\epsilon < \infty$ so that $k > k_\epsilon$ implies, for $z \in K$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$,*

$$\|A_k^{f,z}(\theta)\| \le e^{k(\mathcal{L}(z) + \epsilon)}.$$

Proof Follows immediately by compactness and Corollary 3.4. ∎

4 Proof of the main Lemmas

We will first use Lemma 2.2 to obtain Proposition 2.1.

Proof Fix $f \in \mathrm{PL}_\gamma(\mathbb{T})$, $E \in U$, $\delta \ge 1$ and $1 > \gamma > 0$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$. Let q_n be the sequence of denominators of the continued fraction approximants of ω. Boundedness of the Lyapunov exponent on compact sets in $\mathbb{C}$ follows from upper semicontinuity, so we may define

$$\bar{\chi} = \sup\{\mathcal{L}(z) \in \mathbb{C} : |\Re(z)| \le K; |\Im(z)| \le 1\}.$$

We consider arbitrary irrationals, and make a separate argument for the Diophantine case at the end. If ω is Diophantine let $\xi = 1 + 2\kappa$ where $\kappa > 0$ is as described in (1.9), otherwise, let $\xi = 1$. Let $1 > \tau > 0$ be such that

$$\frac{\tau}{1 - \tau} < \frac{\gamma \zeta \chi}{\delta \xi \bar{\chi}} \tag{4.1}$$

and choose σ so that

$$\frac{\chi\zeta}{\bar{\chi}\delta\xi}(1-\tau) > \sigma > \tau/\gamma.$$

Then from Lemma 2.2 for $k_\tau(E) < k < \frac{1}{\sigma\bar{\chi}} \ln q_n$ there is some $0 \le j \le q_n + q_{n-1} - 1$ so that for $|E - z| < e^{-\tau\bar{\chi}k}$

$$\|A_k^{f,z}(\theta + j\omega)\| \ge \exp\{(1-\tau)k\mathcal{L}\}. \tag{4.2}$$

Fix $k = k(n) = \lfloor \frac{1}{\sigma\bar{\chi}} \ln q_n - 1 \rfloor$. By definition,

$$A_{k+j}^z(\theta) = A_k^z(\theta + j\omega)A_j^z(\theta)$$

and, as $A_k^{f,z}$ is an $\mathbf{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$-cocycle, we have

$$\max_j \left\{ \left\| A_j^{f,z}(\theta) \right\|, \left\| A_{j+k}^{f,z}(\theta) \right\| \right\} \ge \exp\left\{ \frac{1}{2}(1-\tau)k\mathcal{L} \right\} \tag{4.3}$$

for $|z - E| < e^{-\tau k\mathcal{L}(E)}$. By (4.1) we can choose t so that

$$\frac{\sigma\bar{\chi}}{\zeta} < t < \frac{(1-\tau)\chi}{\delta\xi}. \tag{4.4}$$

Finally, let $M_k = e^{tk}$. The first inequality in (4.4) and the choice of k implies that for sufficiently large n, $M_k^\zeta \ge q_n + q_{n-1} - 1 + k$. By (4.4), $M_k^{-\zeta} < e^{-\tau k\bar{\chi}}$ so we have, for $|z - E| < M_k^{-\zeta}$

$$\max_{1 \le j \le M_k^\zeta} \left\| A_j^{f,z}(\theta) \right\|^2 \ge e^{(1-\tau)k\chi} = M_k^{\frac{(1-\tau)\chi}{t}} > M_k^\delta. \tag{4.5}$$

Let $T_n = M_{k(n)}$. Then, for every $E \in U$, there is some n_E so that for $n > n_E$ (2.1) holds. This settles the general case.

If $\mathcal{L}$ is continuous, and U is compact then, by Lemma 2.2 $k_\tau(E)$ is uniform for all $E \in U$, and therefore $n_E = n_0$ is also uniform for $E \in U$.

For the Diophantine case for sufficiently large $T > 0$, let $k = t^{-1} \ln T$. For large n, $q_{n+1} < q_n^{1+\kappa}$ so there exists q_n so that $T^{\frac{\zeta}{1+2\kappa}} < 2q_n + k < T^\zeta$. Let M_k be chosen so that

$$T^{\frac{\zeta}{1+2\kappa}} < M_k^{\frac{\zeta}{1+\kappa}} < 2q_n + k < M_k^\zeta \le T^\zeta.$$

By construction and (4.1), $\delta(1+2\kappa) < (1-\tau)\frac{\chi}{t}$. It follows that, given $E \in U$ there is a $T_E < \infty$ so that for $T > T_E$ and $|z - E| \le T^{-\zeta}$

$$\max_{1 \le j \le T^\zeta} \|A_j(\theta, z)\|^2 \ge \max_{1 \le j \le M_k^\zeta} \|A_j(\theta, z)\|^2 \ge e^{(1-\tau)k\chi} \ge M_k^{\frac{(1-\tau)\chi}{t}} > M_k^{\delta(1+2\kappa)} > T^\delta. \tag{4.6}$$

The second inequality is simply (4.2), and the remaining inequalities follow from parameter choices.

Again, if $\mathcal{L}$ is continuous and U is compact, by Lemma 2.2 $T_E = T_0$ can be chosen uniform for $E \in U$.

To complete the proof, it remains to show the transfer matrices grow on comparable lengths in the positive and negative directions. Note that for an ergodic invertible cocycle, the Lyapunov exponent of the forward cocycles equals the Lyapunov exponent of the backward cocycles. Moreover, if A_k^ω is the cocycle over rotations by ω, then the relation $A_{-k}^{z,\omega}(\theta) = A_k^{z,-\omega}(\theta + \omega)$ holds. Since ω and $-\omega$ have the same sequence of denominators q_n from the continued fraction approximants, we have that for k large, M_k may be chosen exactly the same for A_k^z and A_{-k}^z. ∎

We will obtain approximating polynomials for the rough potentials using Fejer's summability kernel

$$K_N(\theta) = \frac{1}{N+1}\left(\frac{\sin\left(\frac{N+1}{2}\theta\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{1}{2}\theta\right)} \right)^2 = \sum_{-N \le j \le N} \left(1 - \frac{j}{N+1}\right) e^{ij\theta}. \tag{4.7}$$

Let $\hat{f}(i)$ be the Fourier coefficients of f. We have

$$\sigma_N(f)(\theta) := K_N * f(\theta) = \sum_{-N \le j \le N} \left(1 - \frac{|j|}{N+1}\right) \hat{f}(j) e^{ij\theta},$$

is a $2N+1$st degree trigonometric polynomial. Moreover, from the general theory, for $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$, $\sigma_n(f) \to f$ in $L^1(\mathbb{T})$. The following is another standard result on the pointwise rate of convergence at well behaved points.

The γ-Lipschitz function space $L_\gamma(\mathbb{T})$ is defined as the set functions on $\mathbb{T}$ with the norm,

$$\|f\|_{L_\gamma} = \|f\|_\infty + \sup_{t \in \mathbb{T}; |h| > 0} \frac{|f(t+h) - f(t)|}{|h|^\gamma}.$$

Lemma 4.1 [4] *Suppose $f \in L_\gamma(\mathbb{T})$ and for $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$|K_n * f(\theta) - f(\theta)| < K\|f\|_{L_\gamma} n^{-\gamma}$$

where K does not depend on n.

Proof Observe K_n has the following property,

$$|K_n(\theta)| \leq \min\left\{n+1, \frac{\pi^2}{(n+1)\theta^2}\right\}. \tag{4.8}$$

Assume f is γ-Lipschitz on $\mathbb{T}$ with constant C, then using (4.8) and $\sigma = \frac{1}{(n+1)}$

$$\begin{aligned} |K_n * f(\theta) - f(\theta)| &= \left|\int_{\mathbb{T}} K_n(\tau)(f(\tau-\theta) - f(\theta))\mathrm{d}\tau\right| \\ &\leq \int_{[0,\pi]} |K_n(\tau)|\, 2C\tau^\gamma \mathrm{d}\tau \\ &\leq 2C\int_{[0,\sigma)} (n+1)\tau^\gamma \mathrm{d}\tau + 2C\int_{[\sigma,\pi)} \frac{\pi}{n+1}\tau^{\gamma-2}\mathrm{d}\tau \\ &\leq CK'_\gamma n^{-\gamma} \end{aligned}$$

Here K does not depend on f or n, and C is the Lipschitz constant at θ. ∎

Let $\mathbb{I}$ be the set of intervals in $\mathbb{T}$. We say $f \in \mathbb{I} * L_\gamma(\mathbb{T})$, if for $f_i \in L_\gamma(\mathbb{T})$ and $I_i \in \mathbb{I}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$.

$$f(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^r 1_{I_i} f_i(\theta).$$

Lemma 4.2

$$\mathbb{I} * L_\gamma(\mathbb{T}) = PL_\gamma(\mathbb{T})$$

Proof One inclusion is clear. Suppose $f \in PL_\gamma(\mathbb{T})$ where f is continuous on $\mathbb{T}\backslash J_f$ for $\infty > |J_f| \geq 2$ (if f is continous everywhere there is nothing to show, if f is discontinuous at only one point x add $x+\pi$ to J_f). Let $I_i = (a_i, b_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq |J_f|$ be largest intervals in $\mathbb{T}\backslash J_f$ so that $\cup_i I_i = \mathbb{T}\backslash J_f$. The Lipschitz conditions ensure that limits $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+} f(a_i+\epsilon) = f(a_i+0)$ and $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+} f(b_i-\epsilon) = f(b_i-0)$ exist. Now define f_i to be equal to f on I_i and linearly interpolate the points $(b_i, f(b_i-0))$ and $(a_i, f(a_i+0))$ on I_i^c, which clearly defines a γ-Lipschitz function. Then $f = \sum_{i=1}^r 1_{I_i} f_i(\theta)$ so $f \in \mathbb{I} * L_\gamma(\mathbb{T})$. ∎

We will now show uniform upper bounds for cocycles in a neighborhood of $f \in \mathbb{I} * L_\gamma(\mathbb{T})$.

Lemma 4.3 *Suppose $f \in PL_\gamma(\mathbb{T})$, and $E \in \mathbb{C}$ so that $\mathcal{L}(E) > 0$. For any $0 < \tau < \|f\|_\infty^{-1}$ there exists a $k_\tau = k_\tau(E) < \infty$ so that if $q_n > e^{k_\tau \tau \mathcal{L}(E)/\gamma}$ then for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $k_\tau < k < \frac{\gamma}{\tau\mathcal{L}(E)} \ln q_n$ and any $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$ there is some $0 < x \leq q_n + q_{n-1} - 1$ so that for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|z-E| < \exp\{-\tau k\mathcal{L}(E)\}$ and $g \in \mathbb{B}_\infty(\mathbb{T})$ with $\|g-f\|_\infty < e^{-\tau k\mathcal{L}(E)}$, $\|g\|_\infty < \tau^{-1}$, we have*

$$\|A_k^{g,z}(R^x\theta)\| \geq e^{k(1-\tau)\mathcal{L}(E)}.$$

Lemma 2.2 follows immediately from Lemma 4.3 with $g = f$.

Proof It is clearly enough to prove the Lemma for $\tau < 1$. To begin we first fix some parameters for the proof. Let

$$\tau/2 > \nu > \tau/4, \quad \text{and} \quad 1-\tau/16 > a > b > c > 1-\tau/8. \tag{4.9}$$

Finally, let $\bar\eta > 0$ be so small that $\bar\eta < \mathcal{L}(E)\tau/16$.

Write $f = f_1 1_{I_1} + \cdots + f_r 1_{I_r}$ for Lipschitz functions $f_i \in L_\gamma(\mathbb{T})$ and intervals I_i. There is no loss of generality if we assume $r \geq 2$. Let $J(1_{I_i})$ be the set of discontinuities of 1_{I_i}; then the set of discontinuities of f is $J_f = J(f) = \cup_{i=1}^r J(1_{I_i})$. In practice, we will use a simple bound for the supremum norm of f

$$\|f\|_\infty \leq \|f_1\|_\infty + \cdots + \|f_r\|_\infty =: M.$$

[4] This is a formulation of a standard result from harmonic analysis, see for example chapter 1 of [22].

Observe, for $h \in L_\infty(\mathbb{T})$, we have $\|K_N * h\|_\infty \le \|h\|_\infty$. For $f \in \mathbb{I} * L_\gamma(\mathbb{T})$, we write $f_N = \sigma_N(f_1)1_{I_1} + \cdots + \sigma_N(f_r)1_{I_r}$, so we have $\|f_N\|_\infty \le M$. It is clear that

$$\|A^{h,E}\|_\infty \le 1 + \|h\|_\infty + |E|,$$

so we easily have uniform bounds for the cocycle matrices over bounded energies and unifomly bounded potentials.

Let $\epsilon > 0$. There is some $\rho_\epsilon > 0$ and $K_\epsilon < \infty$ (depending on E) so that for $k > K_\epsilon$, and $|z-E| + \|g-f\|_\infty < \rho < \rho_\epsilon$ we have, from Corollary 3.4 with $\eta = 1$,

$$\|A_k^{f,E}(\theta) - A_k^{g,z}(\theta)\| < \rho e^{k(\mathcal{L}(E)+\epsilon\overline{M})} \tag{4.10}$$

where $\overline{M} = \max\{1, \ln[1 + M + \rho_\epsilon + |E|]\}$.

In particular if $g = f_N$, we have by Lemma 4.1

$$\|f_N(R^i\theta) - f(R^i\theta)\|_\infty < C_f N^{-\gamma}, \tag{4.11}$$

Set

$$N = \exp\left\{\mathcal{L}(E)k\frac{\nu}{\gamma}\right\}$$

and let $\epsilon < \bar{\eta}/\overline{M}$. Now there is some K_ϵ so that we can apply (4.10), which we will call M_ϵ. That is, we have $C_f N^{-\gamma} < \frac{1}{2}\rho_\epsilon$ and for $|z-E| < C_f N^{-\gamma}$ we have

$$\|A_k^{f,E}(\theta) - A_k^{f_N,z}(\theta)\| < C_f N^{-\gamma} e^{k(\mathcal{L}(E)+\eta)}. \tag{4.12}$$

Let $A^{f_N,E}$ be the cocycle matrix defined by the potential determined by the sampling function f_N, which is a piecewise polynomial on $|J_f|$ intervals, each supporting a continuous polynomial of order $(2N+1)$.

For a map $B : \mathbb{T} \to SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ and associated cocycle set

$$V_k(t, B) = \left\{\theta \in \mathbb{T} : \frac{1}{k}\ln\|B_k(\theta)\| > t\right\} \subset \mathbb{T}. \tag{4.13}$$

The measure of this set for $B = A^{f,E}$ for large enough k can be bounded below using the fact that $\mathcal{L}(E) = \inf_k \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{1}{k}\ln\|A_k^{f,E}(\theta)\|\mathrm{d}\theta$. Indeed, by Corollary 3.2 there is $k_{f,E} < \infty$ so that for $k > k_{f,E}$ we have for all θ, $\frac{1}{k}\ln\|A_k^{f,E}(\theta)\| < \mathcal{L}(E) + \bar{\eta}$, thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}(E) &\le \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{1}{k}\ln\|A_k^{f,E}(\theta)\|\mathrm{d}\theta \\
&\le |V_k\left(a\mathcal{L}(E), A^{f,E}\right)|(\mathcal{L}(E)+\bar{\eta}) + \left|V_k^c\left(a\mathcal{L}(E), A^{f,E}\right)\right| a\mathcal{L}(E) \\
&\le |V_k\left(a\mathcal{L}(E), A^{f,E}\right)|[(1-a)\mathcal{L}(E)+\bar{\eta}] + a\mathcal{L}(E).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that if U is compact and $\mathcal{L}$ is continuous then, by Lemma 3.5, $k_{f,E}$ can be chosen uniformly for $E \in U$. By the choice of $\bar{\eta}$ we have $\bar{\eta} < (1-a)\mathcal{L}(E)$ so for $k > k_f$,

$$\frac{1}{2} \le \frac{(1-a)\mathcal{L}(E)}{(1-a)\mathcal{L}(E)+\bar{\eta}} \le |V_k\left(a\mathcal{L}(E), A^{f,E}\right)|. \tag{4.14}$$

Furthermore, we make the following claim regarding the sets $V_k(\cdot,\cdot)$, there is some $k_\tau(E) < \infty$ so that for $k > k_\tau(E)$ and $|E-z| < \exp\{-\mathcal{L}(E)\tau k\}$,

$$V_k(a\mathcal{L}(E), A^{f,E}) \subset V_k(b\mathcal{L}(E), A^{f_N,E}) \subset V_k(c\mathcal{L}(E), A^{g,z}). \tag{4.15}$$

First note from the assumption on parameters (4.9),

$$\mathcal{L}(E)(1-\nu) + \bar{\eta} < \mathcal{L}(E)(1-\tau/4) + \tau\mathcal{L}(E)/16 = \mathcal{L}(E)(1-3\tau/16) < \mathcal{L}(E)c \tag{4.16}$$

to show the left inclusion, for $\theta \in V_k\left(a\mathcal{L}(E), A^{f,E}\right)$ write

$$\left\|A_k^{f_N,E}(\theta)\right\| \ge \left\|A_k^{f,E}(\theta)\right\| - \left\|A_k^{f_N,E}(\theta) - A_k^{f,E}(\theta)\right\|$$

from (4.10) and (4.11) we have

$$\left\|A_k^{f_N,E}(\theta) - A_k^{f,E}(\theta)\right\| \le C\cdot N^{-\gamma}e^{k(\mathcal{L}(E)+\bar{\eta})} \le Ce^{k(\mathcal{L}(E)+\bar{\eta}-\mathcal{L}(E)\nu)} < Ce^{ck\mathcal{L}}$$

having used the definition of N in the second to last step and (4.16) in the last step. Putting this together, we have,

$$\left\|A_k^{f_N,E}(\theta)\right\| > e^{ak\mathcal{L}(E)} - Ce^{ck\mathcal{L}(E)} > e^{bk\mathcal{L}(E)}.$$

Where the final inequality clearly holds for large enough k. The right inclusion of (4.15) is similar: for $\theta \in V_k\left(b\mathcal{L}(E), A^{f_N,E}\right)$

$$\|A_k^{g,z}(\theta)\| > \left\|A_k^{f_N,E}(\theta)\right\| - \left\|A_k^{f_N,E}(\theta) - A_k^{f,E}(\theta)\right\| - \left\|A_k^{f,E}(\theta) - A_k^{g,z}(\theta)\right\|$$

The second term on the right can be bounded as above, the last term on the right is bounded similarly using (4.10) and $\epsilon < \bar{\eta}/\overline{M}$ so that $\left\|A_k^{f,E}(\theta) - A_k^{g,z}(\theta)\right\| < Ce^{ck\mathcal{L}}$. Thus, as $b > c$, for large enough k we have,

$$\|A_k^{g,z}(\theta)\| > e^{bk\mathcal{L}(E)} - Ce^{ck\mathcal{L}(E)} > e^{ck\mathcal{L}(E)}$$

which proves the claim.

As before, note that if $\mathcal{L}$ is continuous, then $k_\tau(E)$ can be chosen uniform for E in a compact set U, since the only possible source of nonuniformity over E is the requirement that $k > k_{f,E}$.

Now write $V = V_k(b\mathcal{L}(E), A^{f_N,E})$, combining (4.15) and (4.14) yields $|V| \geq \frac{1}{2}$. On the other hand, V is defined by a piecewise polynomial function. That is, $\mathbb{T}$ is partitioned into $k|J|$ intervals and on each interval $\|A_k^{f_N,E}(\theta)\|^2$ is a polynomial of degree $2k(2N+1)$. At least one interval in the partition must have an intersection with V of size $\frac{1}{4}(k|J|)^{-1}$, and therefore V must contain an interval of length $\frac{1}{4}\frac{1}{k^2(2N+1)|J|}$, which is bounded below by $\exp\{-k\frac{\tau}{\gamma}\mathcal{L}(E)\}$. It follows from (4.15) that $V_k(c\mathcal{L}(E), A^{g,z})$ also contains this interval. We will now use the following fact:

Lemma 4.4 *(e.g. [16]) For an interval $I \subset \mathbb{T}$, if n is such that $|I| > \frac{1}{q_n}$ then for any $\theta \in \mathbb{T}$ there is $0 \leq j \leq q_n + q_{n-1} - 1$ so that $\theta + j\omega \in I$.*

For any $k_\tau < k \leq \frac{\gamma \ln q_n}{\tau \mathcal{L}}$ we have that $V_k(c\mathcal{L}(E), A^{g,z})$ contains an interval of length greater than $\exp\{-k\frac{\tau}{\gamma}\mathcal{L}(E)\}$ which in turn is greater than $\frac{1}{q_n}$, so for some $0 \leq x \leq q_n + q_{n-1} - 1$ we obtain the result. ∎

5 Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Rui Han for helpful input on an early draft and the anonymous referee for careful reading of the manuscript that has led to an important improvement. S.J. is a 2014-15 Simons Fellow. This research was partially supported by NSF DMS-1101578 and DMS-1401204.

References

[1] Arthur Avila. Global theory of one-frequency Schrödinger operators. *Acta Mathematica*, 215(1):1 – 54, 2015.

[2] Jean-Marie Barbaroux, F. Germinet, and Serguei Tcheremchantsev. Fractal dimensions and the phenomenon of intermittency in quantum dynamics. *Duke*, 1:161 –193, 2001.

[3] Kristian Bjerklov. *Dynamical properties of quasi-periodic Schrödinger equations.* PhD thesis, KTH Matematik, 2003.

[4] Jean Bourgain. *Green's function estimates for lattice Schrödinger operators and applications.* Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 2005.

[5] Jean Bourgain and Svetlana Jitomirskaya. Continuity of the Lyapunov exponent for quasiperiodic operators with analytic potential. *Journal of statistical physics*, 108:1203 – 1218, 2001.

[6] Jackson Chan. Method of variations of potential of quasi-periodic Schrödinger equations. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 17(5):1416– 1478, 2008.

[7] Jackson Chan, Micheal Goldstein, and Wilhelm Schlag. On non-perturbative Anderson localization for $\mathcal{C}^\alpha$ potentials generated by shifts and skew-shifts. *preprint*, arXiv:math/0607302 [math.DS], 2006.

[8] David Damanik and Rowan Killip. Ergodic potentials with a discontinuous sampling function are non-deterministic. *Math. Res. Letters*, 212:191 – 204, 1999.

[9] David Damanik and Serguei Tcheremchantsev. Upper bound in quantum transport. *Jounal of the American Mathematical Society*, 20(3):700 – 827, 2007.

[10] David Damanik and Serguei Tcheremchantsev. Quantum dynamics via complex analysis methods: General upper bounds without time-averaging and tight lower bounds for the strongly coupled Fibonacci Hamiltonian. *Jounal of functional analysis*, 255(10):2872 – 2887, 2008.

[11] R. del Rio, Svetlana Jitomirskaya, Yoram Last, and Barry Simon. Operators with singular continuous spectrum. *J. d'Analyse Math*, 69:153–200, 1996.

[12] Alex Furman. On the multiplicative ergodic theorem for uniquely ergodic systems. *Probabilities et Statistiques*, 33(6):797– 815, 1997.

[13] S. Ganeshan, K. Kechedzhi, and S. Das Sarma. Critical integer quantum Hall topology and the integrable Maryland model as a topological quantum critical point. *Phys. Rev. B*, 90, 041405, 2014.

[14] Svetlana Jitomirskaya. Ergodic Schrödinger operators (on one foot). In *Spectral theory and mathematical physics: a Festschrift in honor of Barry Simon's 60th birthday*, pages 613 – 647. Amer. Math. Soc., 2007.

[15] Svetlana Jitomirskaya and Ilya Kachkovskiy. All coupling localization for quasiperiodic operators with Lipschitz monotone potentials. *preprint*, arXiv:1509.02226 [math.SP], 2015.

[16] Svetlana Jitomirskaya and Yoram Last. Power law subordinacy and singular spectra. II. Line operators. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 211(3):643 – 658, 2000.

[17] Svetlana Jitomirskaya and Chris Marx. Analytic quasi-perodic cocycles with singularities and the Lyapunov exponent of extended Harpers model. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 316(1):237–267, 2012.

[18] Svetlana Jitomirskaya and Rajinder Mavi. Continuity of the measure of the spectrum for quasiperiodic Schrödinger operators with rough potentials. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 325(2):585–601, 2014.

[19] Svetlana Jitomirskaya and Herman Schulz-Baldes. Upper bounds on wavepacket spreading for random Jacobi matrices. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 273(3):601–618, 2007.

[20] Svetlana Jitomirskaya, Herman Schulz-Baldes, and Günter Stolz. Delocalization in random polymer models. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 233(1):27–48, 2003.

[21] Svetlana Jitomirskaya and Shiwen Zhang. Quantitative continuity of singular continuous spectral measures and arithmetic criteria for quasiperiodic Schrödinger operators. *preprint*, arXiv:1510.07086 [math.SP], 2015.

[22] Y. Katznelson. *An Introduction to Harmonic Analysis*. Cambridge Mathematical Library. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[23] Yitzhak Katznelson and Benjamin Weiss. A simple proof of some ergodic theorems. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 42:291–296, 1982.

[24] Rowan Killip, Alexander Kiselev, and Yoram Last. Dynamical upper bounds on wavepacket spreading. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 125(5):1165–1198, 2003.

[25] Silvius Klein. Anderson localization for the discrete one-dimensional quasi-periodic Schrödinger operator with potential defined by a Gevrey class function. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 218:255–292, 2005.

[26] Yoram Last. Quantum dynamics and decompositions of singular continuous spectra. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 142(2):406 – 445, 1996.

[27] V.A. Mandel'shtam and S. Ya. Zhitomirskaya. 1d-quaisperiodic operators. Latent symmetries. *Commununications in Mathematical Physics*, 39(3):589–604, 1991.

[28] Barry Simon. Equilibrium measures and capacities in spectral theory. *Inverse Problems and Imaging*, 1(4):713 – 772, 2007.

[29] Eugene Sorets and Thomas Spencer. Discrete one-dimensional quasi-periodic Schrödinger operators with pure point spectrum. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 142(3):543 – 566, 1991.

[30] Mor Verbin, Oded Zilberberg, Yaacov E. Kraus, Yoav Lahini, and Yaron Silberberg. Observation of topological phase transitions in photonic quasicrystals. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 110, 076403, 2013.

[31] Peter Walters. *An introduction to Ergodic Theory*. Springer, 1982.

[32] Yiqian Wang and Jiangong You. Examples of discontinuity of Lyapunov exponent in smooth quasiperiodic cocycles. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 162(13):2363–2412, 2013.

[33] Yiqian Wang and Zhenghe Zhang. Cantor spectrum for a class of C^2 quasiperiodic Schrödinger operators. *preprint*, arXiv:1410.0101[math.DS], 2014.

[34] Yiqian Wang and Zhenghe Zhang. Uniform positivity and continuity of Lyapunov exponents for a class of C^2 quasiperiodic Schrödinger cocycles. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 268(9):2525–2585, 2015.

[35] Zhenghe Zang. Positive Lyapunov exponents for quasiperiodic Szegö cocycles. *Nonlinearity*, 25:1771, 2012.